IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

PERRY A. MARCH, in his capacity as the)	
father of SAMSON LEO MARCH and)	
TZIPORA JOSETTE MARCH, both minor	r)	
children,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	Civil No. 3:00-0736
)	Judge Trauger
LAWRENCE E. LEVINE and)	
CAROLYN R. LEVINE,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
	ORDER	

The respondents have filed a Request to Depose Petitioner's Counsel concerning their request for attorney's fees. (Docket No. 159) Petitioner's counsel has filed a Motion to Quash Deposition Subpocnas which were sent by facsimile copy to petitioner's counsel but have not yet been served upon them. Respondents' request to depose is **DENIED**, and the subpoenas, if they have been properly issued, are hereby **QUASHED**.

As is the usual procedure, respondents shall file their objections to the application for attorney's fees, accompanied by any affidavits which they choose to file. This court is intimately familiar with this litigation and is granted wide discretion in the award of attorney's fees.

Petitioner's counsel will be granted reasonable fees based upon their efforts and an hourly rate that is justified, taking into account all submittals by the respondents. If respondents need additional time within which to file their objections, they should file a motion for an extension,

This document was entered on the docket in compliance with Rule 58 and / or Rule 79 (a).

FRCP, on 2/4/02 By 195



and a reasonable extension of time will be granted. If, after reviewing the submittals by the parties, this court feels that additional information would be helpful to its decision, it will see to it that the necessary information is provided through a mechanism structured by the court.

The United States Supreme Court has aptly stated that the award of attorney's fees "should not result in a second major litigation." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 (1983); *Hadix v. Johnson*, 65 F.3d 532, 536 (6th Cir. 1995). The opponent of a fee application has no right to any kind of discovery, and the court may even forbid the filing of countervailing affidavits, *Rolex Watch U.S.A., Inc. v. Crowley*, 74 F.3d 716, 721 (6th Cir. 1996), which this court has chosen not to do.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that no party may engage in discovery until and unless allowed by the court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

ENTER this 4th day of February 2002.

ALETA A. TRAUGER

U.S. District Judge